SUBJECTS.

If the Member has any suggestions to make, he might put them in writing and send the same to Government. They will then be forwarded to Mr. Sankara Menon for consideration.

15. Modifications in the Civil Courts Regulation Amendment Bill.

Mr. K. Krishnan Pandalay (Member, Quilon Taluk) said that the people of the Quilon taluk which he represented had specially asked him to place before the Assembly their views regarding one of the changes proposed to be introduced by the Civil Courts Regulation Amendment Bill, *viz.*, the provision regarding the enhancement of the ordinary jurisdiction of the Munsiffs from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,000. It was also resolved at the preliminary meeting of the members of the Assembly held on Saturday, the 7th November, at which about 27 members were present, that the desirability of retaining the jurisdiction of the Munsiffs at its present standard, *viz.*, Rs. 1,000, should be placed before Government as coming from them generally. It could not be considered as any disparagement to the Munsiffs as a class when it is said that, judging from the way in which cases were dealt with in the Munsiffs' Courts and in the District Courts, the people were unable to place as much confidence in the Munsiffs as they did in the District Judges. The volume of work expected out of the Munsiffs (both original and small cause suits) was far too large. Further, the legal assistance that people could get in the Munsiffs' Courts, except in places where there was also a District Court, was not anything like what could be had in the District Courts. For these reasons, he said that the people were against the proposed enhancement of jurisdiction, as they feared that the quality of justice was thereby bound to suffer. Speaking of the amount itself, there could be no doubt that Rs. 2,000 was much more than the worth of an average ryot in Travancore. The reason urged for the proposed change was to relieve the congestion in the Civil Courts; but the Courts which really stood in need of relief were the Munsiffs' Courts and the enhancement of their pecuniary jurisdiction was not a measure calculated to bring about that result. As for the District Courts, substantial relief was afforded to them when the ordinary jurisdiction of Munsiffs was raised to Rs. 1,000 by Regulation I of 1077. In the Quilon District Court, there were only about 170 suits last year. This could not be considered as too much work for a District Judge. The Member therefore requested that the Bill might be modified so as to leave the ordinary jurisdiction of the Munsiffs at Rs. 1,000.

Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) requested that the small cause jurisdiction of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Munsiffs should not be raised from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 as proposed in the new Bill. It was only 7 years ago that the jurisdiction of the Munsiffs was increased from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50 in the case of selected Munsiffs by Regulation I of 1077. Neither the condition of the country nor the personnel of the Courts had changed since that year in such a way as to justify the sudden enhancement of jurisdiction as was contemplated. A careful analysis of the small cause suits that were being filed in the Munsiffs' Courts would show that they were suits relating to promissory notes, small loans on pledges of ornaments, arrears of pattom or pathivaram, chitty transactions and the like, and in most of those cases the amount would be seen not to exceed Rs. 100. Considering the volume of cases and the limited time at the disposal of the Munsiffs, the disposal of cases could not but be summary and perfunctory. The proposed change therefore was sure to work great hardship to the poor people of the country and, as such, should not be introduced.

Mr. Chacko Chacko (Member, Ettumanur Taluk) supported Mr. Kochukunju Pillai and said that the small cause jurisdiction of the Munsiffs should not be enhanced any further. If the object of the Bill was to afford relief to the Courts, it could be easily achieved by raising the number of Munsiffs. The analogy of the powers of similar officers in British India could not justify the change, as the conditions in Travancore greatly differed from those of British India. There was no appeal from the decisions of Munsiffs in small cause cases and the power of revision vesting in the High Court was rarely being availed of by the poor people owing to the heavy cost involved. He therefore said that the provisions of the Bill relating to the enhancement of the small cause jurisdiction of Munsiffs should not be passed.

Dewan's reply.—The Bill awaits final reading in the Council. I may also say that it has been so far passed by a practically unanimous vote. Government see no reason to change it in respect to the matters now brought to notice.

16. *Amendment of the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation, V of 1071.*

Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai (Member, Trivandrum Taluk) said that the evils of the existing Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation had been brought to the notice of Government at the last three sessions of the Assembly, but the replies given were not encouraging and the grievances of the people still remained unredressed. Ever since the passing of the Regulation thirteen years ago, it had been peculiarly unpopular. As observed at the discussion of the Bill in the Legislative Council by

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly